

**Karner Blue HCP Semi-annual Review Meeting  
October 19, 2005  
8:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.  
USFWS New Franken**

**MINUTES**

***Theme of Meeting:***

***Discuss Safe Harbor amendment and ITP permit extension; and continue discussions on streamlining efforts, i.e. status updates on current efforts and discussions on additional improvements that would streamline HCP implementation and administration processes.***

**Attending:** Janet Smith, Cathy Carnes, Jimmy Christenson, Matt Krumenauer, Bob Hess, Dave Lentz, Crystal Fankhauser, Joe Henry (recorder)

Meeting was called to order by Dave Lentz at 8:30 AM. Dave gave a brief summary of what the partners had discussed at the last IOC meeting regarding a long-term permit extension. In light of where we are today with the HCP in regards to both Safe Harbor (long-term assurance through HCP), and rethinking how/what the ITP renewal process might look like, we have two very significant items to think about and focus discussion on today.

**Safe Harbor & ITP Renewal**

**1. Safe Harbor and ITP Renewal**

- Status of Sand County Foundation MOU w/ WDNR  
Dave and Jimmy have forwarded a new draft MOU to SCF for review. The draft includes the SH brochure, reporting functions and other KBB HCP assistance. SCF has the next step to contact DNR to schedule a meeting date to discuss the MOU and contract support for data management services.
- Status of DNR's request for modified Safe Harbor/Umbrella Amendment re: proactive conservation. Cathy and Dave will need to work on the nuts and bolts of this in a proposed minor amendment to the HCP's current SH language. WDNR will also need to consider how to address state species (state ITP?)
- Reviewed 10-10-05 IOC discussion on 50-year ITP renewal and DNR's position on same and the IOC's suggested process and timeline. Dave felt it would be important for the Service to be involved in partner' discussion of this topic. He requested Service participation in partner-wide discussion at the 2006 winter HCP team meeting. Janet is retiring in November, but she said someone from the Service would be there.

Janet noted that the 50-year renewal timeframe was selected as what might be the maximum amount of time needed to recover the species. That is not to say that 50 years has to be the timeframe partners agree to sign on for. Getting partners to agree upon some extended time period is most important. Some issues that need to be considered for all partners are costs associated with the program, which processes are costing the most, and can the program still function if some processes are eliminated or revised at a cheaper cost? The counties are on a 10-year planning schedule and therefore it is unlikely they will be able to make commitments beyond 10 years.

Dave summarized the conversation by saying that the point is to begin thinking about how we can repackage and streamline the HCP processes to be easier and less expensive to implement and more attractive to partners in a longer term context.

Dave said that the Division of Forestry has been supporting the administrative costs of implementing the statewide HCP. This is not certain to continue for 50 years. Jimmy noted that DNR might want to consider discussing a possible Division-wide charge back for DNR programs that benefit from the HCP. Under state law DNR cannot accept funds from those they regulate.

### **Monitoring System Improvements and Issues:**

2. Brief progress report: Cause-Effect (C-E) monitoring done in 2005. (see handout)  
Crystal gave a brief report indicating some of the problematic issues with the reports. The primary issue seems to be with the similar appearance of the level 1 and C-E survey forms. Secondly, C-E surveys require 2 visits; one in each flight period in order to observe vegetation response of nectar plants in both flights. This differs from a standard level 1 survey. Some partners did go out during the second flight period.

**Action item: WDNR will work to improve form.**

3. “Pre-management Survey Exemption”. Objective: Focus where it matters. Update on proposed amendment (Matt & Dave)

Matt reported that a proposal regarding pre-management survey exemptions will be submitted to the IOC to get feedback. The goal is to establish a process under which categories of potential exemptions are defined that allows partners to determine if the likelihood of habitat warrants a pre-management survey. Ultimately, the process will be documented and verified through audits. Cathy advised that proposed survey exemptions be supported by biological data.

4. Shifting Mosaic 200 sites/year inventory: Some SM partners are running out of legitimate places to look for lupine habitat. We knew this would happen sometime. What are some options we might consider as partners approach this situation?

Begin to think more seriously about using GIS and Ted Sickley’s lupine modeling to help partners develop a better strategy/approach to identifying likely lupine areas and focusing limited resources where it matters. Cathy suggested monitoring shifting mosaic sites and keeping lupine and KBB status information up to date. WDNR plans to put lupine and KBB layers on line; some partners have completed surveys of occupied habitat.

**Action item: At the November IOC meeting, the IOC will discuss options and develop alternatives for a long-term HCP. All systems in HCP chapter 2 and appendix F should be considered. The goal would be to have a draft proposal distributed to all partners in January so partners can prepare to discuss a redesigned HCP in the context of a long-term ITP renewal.**

**Action item: WDNR: Amend HCP to remove requirement that partners monitor 200 sites per year and related monitoring protocol in Appendix 2F.**

5. Trends Monitoring needs to be redesigned. DNR envisions recovery properties providing long-term trend data, and partners managing “with consideration” contributing level 1 and level 2 pre- and post-management surveys to support indices.

**Dave suggested that we want to have permanent monitoring sites established on recovery properties so that we have “unmanaged” populations to monitor and compare with populations where management is occurring. This can be refined to potentially show how certain management activities influence population response. It may also be beneficial to record how many acres of habitat (by type or management) support KBBs and gauge population trends in this way.**

**Action item: The Monitoring Improvement Team (MIT) to assess the goals of trends monitoring to better understand what types of data will give us valuable information to help us achieve the goals of the HCP.**

6. Demonstrating Shifting Mosaic. It may take a comprehensive GIS system with each SM partner and DNR’s Central Office to accomplish this. This will cost more for some partners than they can afford. Is it the expectation that partners will use this to access if a SM is functioning for each known KBB population? And if one is not, is it expected (required) that the partner make changes in land management to restructure the landscape to facilitate a functioning SM into the future? If not, then what value is there in asking a partner in an audit to “demonstrate how partner is applying a shifting mosaic”?

Dave commented that through the audit process, partners are having great difficulty in detailing the concept of SM to something they can specifically demonstrate. Most partners can generally describe SM on their land. Those partners, who can show SM function, do so with a map, i.e. Wausau Papers wall map. Dave stressed that it is becoming apparent that there is a need to have a GIS based system to help partners better understand if they are effectively demonstrating shifting mosaics. How we get there is still to be determined, we are working on a couple ideas. Small partners may be able to use aerial maps in conjunction with dot labels to identify where lupine and butterflies occur, and where Kbb’s may possibly disperse in response to management activities. Cathy indicated that we need to work on ways to be more prudent about demonstrating that what we/partners agreed to do are actually being done. Bob suggested that we ask partners **“how are you managing for consideration of Kbb’s” instead of how are you applying SM because in managing SM they made the commitment to manage for consideration.** Cathy suggested developing a reporting form for SM to help partners document what they are doing for SM.

**Action item: Bob will look in the HCP to determine what we intended by our wording about shifting mosaic (Cathy’s list).**

**Action item: Cathy will look at how other HCPs with forest lands are documenting their shifting mosaic activities.**

Action item: WDNR to look into developing a reporting form to help document SM activities.

7. No Net Loss of Habitat. Measuring and demonstrating NNLOH is a mystery. What if partners can not demonstrate this? How important is it? Is a better goal to show how partners will continue necessary habitat disturbances on the landscape? Isn’t this what partners were doing before listing, which resulted in the Kbb’s widespread occurrence on Wisconsin’s working landscape?

It seems more plausible that partners are ensuring through their management practices that enough habitat is created on the landscape that may benefit Kbb's rather than worrying about how many acres of habitat are being lost each year.

**Janet said that partners would be able to demonstrate NNLOH goal by another (or additional) means than static habitat measurements. Partners should look for other indicators that are measurable, that would help demonstrate the goal.**

#### HCP Administration Processes

8. Inclusion Process update. Improvement in efficiency is still needed.
- SHCAs are signed before FWS receives CI request, then FWS makes a final review. This seems out of order. If FWS final review found a problem, would the SHCA need to be amended? Yes. How can we resolve this problem?  
Develop SHCA to its final draft, and then submit to FWS for review. Cathy should get a final draft prior to submitting to FWS permit coordinator. After obtaining FWS comments; work with partner, and FWS (as necessary) to finalize SHCA prior to getting signatures.
  - It is always difficult, time consuming and costly to renegotiate SHCAs with each additional volley. What is the cause of this problem? How might we improve on this without adding more work? Cathy is open to review drafts or concepts related to development of SHCAs as they are being negotiated. Make sure SHCA clearly addresses all information needs in the template SHCA provided in the HCP.
  - How else can workload be reduced in the Inclusion process? (see above)

**Action DNR: In light of the idea of a long-term permit renewal, the DNR will need to consider what administrative and recruiting capacity will be available into the future.**

**Action item: WDNR send draft SHCAs to FWS for review prior to finalizing.**

9. Mitigation planning is very inefficient and costly. DNR (Dave) feels like a messenger carrying information back and forth between the partner and the FWS. DNR envisions a formatted template for permanent take and temporary take that requires very little or no approvals. Is this doable; and without adding work? How else can we reduce workload? Cathy stated this development of mitigation guidelines for temporary take should be doable – and if the mitigation plan is developed per those guidelines, then FWS approval should be quick. Permanent take situations may require more involved case by case review, but we can still develop guidelines – partners should be working on mitigation plans well before the need to take occupied KBB habitat is planned to occur.

**Action Item: Dave stated that they may ask partners to identify whether they plan any temporary or permanent take in their annual report.**

**Action Item: Cathy and Dave keep working on draft mitigation guidelines currently under development – complete a working set of guidelines for temporary take.**

We may need to consider asking partners to hire a consultant to assist them with these projects as neither Dave nor Cathy has the time or money to provide this service for them. It also is a feature, which the HCP does not have to provide a function for in the future. Mitigation planning may simply be a part of the project's cost not provided for by the Service or DNR.

10. April 14, 2005 WDNR request to amend ITP: ITP Naming convention (condition C.1) and recovery implementation plan extension (condition M). Need to define and agree on whether new partners to the HCP need to be identified on the permit.

Permit Condition C states “additional partners/participants may be included as described in the HCP. Permit coverage ..... is effective upon issuance of a CI from the.. (Service).”

Therefore new HCP partners (issued CIs) can just be kept on a separate list, and (optionally, if WDNR desires) they can be added to C.1 of the Permit.. DNR is considering listing original partners for which the ITP acts as their CI (as C.1.a.) and new partners who receive an actual CI below the original partners (as C.1.b.). The two variations would be to either delete partners who transfer or leave them listed, but note the change, i.e. “withdrawn: Georgia Pacific – sold to Plum Creek.” Then Plum Creek would be listed in C.1.b. Dave said he prefers to note withdrawn partners on the permit because it shows the transfers and provides an easy paper trail. Cathy agreed it was good to include former as well as current partners to show paper trail. .

Action: Cathy will tell Pete Fasbender to hold on issuing amendment 5 until the request is revised.

Action: Dave will resubmit a request to amend ITP when other pending amendments are ready.

11. Fast track approval process (We wanted to review progress on this.)

*(At earlier HCP review meeting)* Cathy & Dave proposed that this not be a formal process. No issues have occurred that have not required additional questions.

*(At last HCP review meeting)* We need to re-visit this. Right now, we don't have anything like this yet. We have a procedure now to streamline what we do, but we don't have anything for “fast track”.

Dave handed out the amendment process and approval chart that he and Cathy have developed and have been using. This still needs some tweaking. In light of the idea of a long-term renewal, both the DNR and the Service will have to entertain any and all ways to reduce workload for both.

12. Training and Orientation Systems are being improved. However, the more complicated the HCP is, the more difficult and costly it is to train new staff and new partners, and the greater the opportunity for error. How else can we improve this system, reduce complexity and workload? The IOC will be looking to see what can be eliminated that does not add conservation value, but only serves to fulfill compliance for compliance' sake. The IOC (mostly Matt with help from Joe) is working on an orientation system for new partners and new staff of existing partners. In addition, Matt had the idea of a mentor corps where experienced partners would help new folks to get up to speed. While this first attempt will be tailored to utility partners, it should be a model that can be adapted to everyone. Matt also suggested a forum for this type of training could be tutorials the day before the HCP whole Team's winter meetings.

13. Lands Database: The HCP needs an efficient and accurate system. What is DNR/IOC doing about this? What is the timeline?

The current system is a manual/paper system. The land transfers submitted (usually via annual reports) go on file. However, there is no direct amendment to a partner's SHCA appendix A. The IOC has discussed an electronic system which would provide partners the ability to access the data base and update their own “lands included”. This will take a great

deal of work and money. First thing is to get buy-in from the partners. This will take at least 2-3 years to complete. With the permit renewal issue, the lands data base project will not get started until sometime in the summer of 2006.

14. Changed circumstances reports - are these getting done? Yes. Dave shared some current reports with Cathy.
15. Partners' new KBB occurrences being entered in NHI? HCP Data Manager submits positive level 2 surveys to BER to enter into NHI. BER is behind on entering them.
16. IOC Reps include a Limited Partner: Ron Chamberlain (Adams County Hwy. Dept.). Ron has been very instrumental in developing HCP implementation processes for ROW managers. His road ROW experience in the HCP and his enthusiasm adds an added diversity to the IOC.
17. Commercial Forestry Minor Amendment – DNR needs to change HCP and publish announcement.

#### **Inclusion Issues and Updates**

18. Status of new applicants

- Plum Creek Timber (CI Request submitted to Service at meeting)
- Oakdale Electric Cooperative (CI Request submitted to Service at meeting)

Action: Cathy said she would begin her review of these requests the first part of next week.

19. New applicants anticipated in 2006

- Century Tel
- Dairyland Power
- Adams-Columbia Electric Cooperative

Adams-Columbia has put joining the HCP on a fast track. They may be ready to join before the end of 2005.

20. Utility/RR Inclusion Invitation is still on hold. Continue to hold or change objectives?  
Is still ready and on hold but not released yet. Is it okay to release or leave on hold? Janet agreed that we can keep it on hold for an additional 6 months.

#### **Recovery Related Issues**

21. KBB population survey for Recovery at GLG: update status

Cathy said the USGS grant application did not get funded. (Post Meeting Information: The Service and USGS are considering putting together a KBB monitoring workshop for next year for managers monitoring KBB populations and needing advice on monitoring strategies).

22. Possible opportunity for partners to participate in recovery (Recovery and HCP Land Acquisition Grants) Matt: Action to notify partners of opportunity. Any partners show interest in Recovery?  
Matt said no one responded.

#### **Partner Issues and Amendments**

23. Clark County SHCA amendment (re: thinning)

Clark Co. wants to remove one of its conservation measures re: thinning (they are finding out that it does not result in making the habitat better for KBBs) Cathy asked if Clark County would replace this with another proactive form of conservation. Dave felt it was not necessary. Clark County Forestry (Rick Dailey) is leading the SM partners in understanding how to demonstrate SM. Rick is also recruiting new partners and developing collaborative conservation efforts.

Action: Dave agreed to ask if Clark County Forestry would consider a substitute conservation activity. Dave will prepare an SHCA amendment for FWS approval.

24. Monroe County Forest SHCA amendment to Long Term Habitat Mgmt. Monroe County Forestry has requested a change in their Long Term Habitat Mgmt. plan. They have re-evaluated the sites they want to do LTH management on. Other sites are proving to be better quality and strategically more appropriate.

Action: Dave will prepare an SHCA amendment for the Service's review.

25. ANR pipeline exemption issue - did they survey for lupine this year? Yes. Jim Heap supplying DNR with additional documentation.

Action: Dave is working on an SHCA amendment request for this pre-management survey exemption.

26. KBB Egg Salvage – Town of Swiss (Burnett County). Dave finishing up a report on the salvage operation. Surveys will have to be done in 2006 flight periods to assess KBB status.

Action: Dave will provide report to Service. Town of Swiss has no staff trained in monitoring. Dave will ask Burnett County Hwy. Dept. if they can do level 1 & 2 surveys on the salvage sites and the habitat replacement sites.

27. ATV use - review how this is covered in HCP. Dave recalled that ATV use is covered under the HCP as a recreational activity, like deer hunting. Development of new trails would likely be done by a partner entity and would therefore be subject to review. Bob Hess said the only way to control illegal ATV activity is through enforcement.

Joe will research HCP to see how ATV use is covered in the HCP.

28. Set next meeting date.

**The next HCP 6-month Review meeting will be April 19, 2006 in Madison.**